EXHIBIT G

From: Marriott, Michelle L. (SHB) [MLMARRIOTT@shb.com]

Sent: Friday, December 23, 2011 9:30 AM

To: Reckers, Robert H. (SHB); Hann, Bree

Cc: Hixson, Thomas S.; Howard, Geoff; 'Kieran Ringgenberg'; Redmond, Megan J. (SHB); Buresh, Eric A.

(SHB)

Subject: RE: Oracle v. Rimini Street

Kieran and Bree,

As discussed during yesterday's meet-and-confer, here is a summary of Rimini Street's positions with respect to its Second and Third 30(b)(6) notices. As we stated, through our previous correspondence and our discussions yesterday, Rimini Street continues to evaluate its outstanding discovery requests in light of information provided by Oracle (some of which was continuing to be provided by Oracle just over the last two weeks). The proposals listed below are part of our continued effort to narrow the issues on which we still need discovery from Oracle, and we remain interested in obtaining that discovery in the most efficient manner.

We agree to withdraw 2nd Notice Topics 1-5, 19, 23, 27-28, 31, 34-38, 40, 41, 48-55, 59-60 and 3rd Notice Topics 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 22.

<u>Topic 6:</u> Please identify, for each copyright registration where the derivative box is checked, the work of which it is a derivative.

2nd Notice Topics 7-13, 16, 42-47, 57-58, and 3rd Notice Topics 11, 13: Oracle has not identified the legal theories on which it intends to rely at trial with respect to its copyright infringement, breach of contract, and inducement claims. Specifically, we are requesting an identification of (1) each Rimini Street action, (2) the contractual provision and/or copyright that Oracle contends was breached/infringed as a result of Rimini Street's action, and (3) whether Oracle will contend at trial that the action was copyright infringement, breach of contract, inducement, or some combination. If Oracle does not supplement these interrogatories, we will assume that the information provided in the interrogatories is the totality on which Oracle intends to rely at trial. We discussed a supplementation to the following interrogatories:

- Contract:
 - o Rog 11:
 - o Rog 32
- Copyright:
 - o Rog 17
 - o Rog 18
- Topic 45: Rog 36

2nd Notice Topic 14: Provide testimony.

2nd Notice Topic 15: Oracle has stipulated that Rimini Street is a competitor.

2nd Notice Topic 17: Supplement Rog 25 or provide testimony.

2nd Notice Topic 18: Propose designating Catz Dep. 127:10-131:12 and Phillips Dep. 57:25-59:15 as 30(b)(6).

2nd Notice Topic 20: Our December 6 letter offered to stipulate that "Oracle is not, and has never been, willing to grant Rimini Street a license for its support of PeopleSoft, J.D. Edwards, Siebel, or Oracle software." Alternatively, we propose designating Phillips Dep. 170:6-172:4 and Catz Dep.164:19-170:3 as 30(b)(6).

2nd Notice Topic 21: Provide testimony.

2nd Notice Topic 22: Provide testimony.

 $\underline{2^{nd}}$ Notice Topic 24: Previously offered stipulations in our December 6 letter. Alternatively, we propose designating Phillips Dep. 170:6-172:4 and Catz Dep. 164:19-166:11 as 30(b)(6).

 2^{nd} Notice Topic 25: Previously offered stipulation. Alternatively we proposed designating Phillips Dep 170:15-23 and Catz Dep 166:6-11 as 30(b)(6).

 2^{nd} Notice Topics 26 and 30: We proposed that Oracle stipulate that Rimini Street's conduct has not resulted in a lost opportunity for Oracle to license Oracle software, and that Oracle has received full payment under its own contracts with customers at issue. Absent that stipulation, these topics stand.

2nd Notice Topics 32-33: We propose designating Cummins Dep. 213:14-23 as 30(b)(6).

2nd Notice Topic 39: Update Rog 27, or provide testimony.

 2^{nd} Notice Topic 56: Update Rog 37, stipulate that Oracle does not receive any revenue off of its development databases, or provide testimony.

2nd Notice Topic 61: Provide testimony.

 $\underline{3}^{\underline{rd}}$ Notice Topic 5: Update Rog 30, or provide testimony.

<u>3rd Notice Topic 10/19:</u> Provide testimony.

<u>3rd Notice Topic 12</u>: Update Rog 19, or provide testimony.

<u>3rd Notice Topic 14:</u> Update Rog 20, or provide testimony.

 3^{rd} Notice Topic 17: Rog 21 identifies some instances of alleged interference. Unless updated, we assume this is what Oracle intends to rely on at trial.

Thanks, Michelle

From: Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)

Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 4:19 PM

To: 'Hann, Bree'

Cc: 'Hixson, Thomas S.'; 'Howard, Geoff'; 'Kieran Ringgenberg'; Redmond, Megan J. (SHB); Marriott, Michelle L.

(SHB); Buresh, Eric A. (SHB)

Subject: RE: Oracle v. Rimini Street

Bree,

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you. We are available at 1pm Pacific (3 Central) tomorrow to confer regarding the deposition notices. Please let me know if that time still works for Oracle. We can use the below dial-in info:

(800) 394-7219 Passcode: 291622

Thanks, Rob

From: Hann, Bree [mailto:bree.hann@bingham.com] Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 10:54 AM

To: Reckers, Robert H. (SHB)

Cc: Hixson, Thomas S.; Howard, Geoff; Kieran Ringgenberg

Subject: FW: Oracle v. Rimini Street

Rob,

We are available to meet and confer regarding Rimini's 30(b)(6) notices on Wednesday, December 21, from 9-2:30 Pacific, or Thursday, December 22, from 12-4:30 Pacific. Please let me know what times work for you.

Thanks, Bree

From: Glidewell, Jeff O. (SHB) [mailto:JGLIDEWELL@shb.com]

Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2011 8:15 AM

To: Banks, Christopher (SHB); Buresh, Eric A. (SHB); Dykal, Ryan D. (SHB); Guglielmi, Celia (SHB); Hixson, Thomas S.; Marriott, Michelle L. (SHB); Niegowski, David J. (SHB); norton; Palumbo, Kristen A.; phan; Reckers,

Robert H. (SHB); Redmond, Megan J. (SHB); ringgenberg; Tong, Jared M. (SHB)

Cc: Broz, Rebecca J. (SHB)
Subject: Oracle v. Rimini Street

Counsel:

Please find an attached letter from Mr. Reckers to Mr. Hixson regarding Rimini Street's Second 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice.

Thank you.



Jeff Glidewell

Intellectual Property Paralegal 2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108 PHONE: 816.474.6550 Extn 12505

FAX: 816.421.5547 JGLIDEWELL@shb.com Mail Gate made the following annotations on Wed Dec 14 2011 10:15:21

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Confidentiality Notice: The information in this e-mail (including attachments, if any) is considered confidential and is intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited except by or on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by reply email, delete this email, and do not disclose its contents to anyone.

Bingham McCutchen LLP Circular 230 Notice: To ensure compliance with IRS requirements, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by any taxpayer, for the purpose of avoiding any federal tax penalties. Any legal advice expressed in this message is being delivered to you solely for your use in connection with the matters addressed herein and may not be relied upon by any other person or entity or used for any other purpose without our prior written consent.

Mail Gate made the following annotations on Fri Dec 23 2011 11:29:47

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.